Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,789	MOTSENBOCKER, TOM
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jermie Cozart	3726
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: <u>allowed</u>
(1) <u>Jermie Cozart</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Joel Skinner</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>13 June 2005</u>	Time: <u>6:00 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
none		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE Constitution Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	TWAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation not result in resolution of all issues. A brief su 	on. The examiner will provide a parate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
		•
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During a telephone conversation with Joel Skinner, the Examiner informed Mr. Skinner that there was not proper antecedent basis for "the stationary member" and "the rotatable member" in claim 1. Also the Examiner informed Mr. Skinner that it was unclear as to how "the central aperture contacts, compresses, and crimps the stent". Mr. Skinner agreed to provide proper antecedent basis for the stationary and rotatable members, as well change "central aperture" to - segment distal ends- - in order to clearly identify the member which performs the associated function. All of these changes were agreed to be performed by an examiner's amendment.